## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,		) Case	No. CR (3	-355	WHA
	Plaintiff, v.	) STIP	ULATED OI ER THE SPI	RDER EX	CLUDING TIME IAL ACT
Jose Bran	Ido Zamp <b>en</b> -Baulon Defendant.	,			UU/N 1 m
Tose Proudo Lamper—Boulor  Defendant.  To the reasons stated by the parties on the record on June 1)  Speedy Trial Act from					
	Failure to grant a continuance woul See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ld be likely to re	esult in a mis	carriage of	f justice.
	The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).				
	Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).				
	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).				
$\overline{\mathcal{L}}$	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).				
IT IS S	SO ORDERED.  D: 6/N/		APL BEELE		ge
STIPU	LATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assist	ant United S	tates Attor	rney